arXiv:1411.5712v2 [cs.GT] 16 Aug 2015

Do Capacity Constraints Constrain Coalitions?*

Michal Feldman
Blavatnik School of Computer Science
Tel Aviv University

Ofir Geri
Blavatnik School of Computer Science
Tel Aviv University

Abstract

We study strong equilibria in symmetric capacitated cost-sharing games. In these games, a graph with designated source s and sink t is given, and each edge is associated with some cost. Each agent chooses strategically an s-t path, knowing that the cost of each edge is shared equally between all agents using it. Two variants of cost-sharing games have been previously studied: (i) games where *coalitions* can form, and (ii) games where edges are associated with *capacities*; both variants are inspired by real-life scenarios. In this work we combine these variants and analyze strong equilibria (profiles where no coalition can deviate) in capacitated games. This combination gives rise to new phenomena that do not occur in the previous variants. Our contribution is two-fold. First, we provide a topological characterization of networks that always admit a strong equilibrium. Second, we establish tight bounds on the efficiency loss that may be incurred due to strategic behavior, as quantified by the strong price of anarchy (and stability) measures. Interestingly, our results are qualitatively different than those obtained in the analysis of each variant alone, and the combination of coalitions and capacities entails the introduction of more refined topology classes than previously studied.

Keywords: network congestion games, cost-sharing games, strong price of anarchy, strong equilibrium, coalitions, capacities, network topology

1 Introduction

The construction of networks by autonomous agents can be significantly affected by strategic behavior. These situations are frequently modeled as *cost-sharing* connection games, which have been extensively studied [1, 3, 4, 7, 8]. For example, consider the construction of a large computer network used by different countries, where each country is an autonomous system that serves its own strategic interests.

In cost-sharing games, a network is given and each edge is associated with a cost. Each one of n agents wishes to construct a path between its source and sink nodes, where the cost of each edge is shared equally between the agents who use it; each agent desires to minimize his individual cost. Returning to our motivating example, a large computer network may be used by different countries, which should jointly cover its cost. All countries wish to use the network links, but prefer to do so at minimal cost.

*An earlier version of this work has appeared in the Proceedings of the 29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-15). This work was partially supported by the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) / ERC grant agreement number 337122.



Figure 1: A game with no SE played on a simple EP network

The analysis of these games evolved around the Nash equilibrium (NE) notion — a profile of strategies in which no agent can benefit from a unilateral deviation. In recent years, two interesting variants of these games have been considered, both inspired by real-life scenarios. First, a group of agents may form a *coalition* and collaborate for the benefit of all the members in the coalition. This scenario is formalized using the notion of a *strong equilibrium* (SE) [5]. A SE is a strategy profile from which no coalition can deviate in a way that benefits each one of its members. SE in cost-sharing connection games have been studied in [7]. The second variant considers capacity constraints on the network edges [8]. Here, each edge is associated with some capacity that limits the number of agents who can use it. Both variants can naturally occur in our motivating example. Indeed, countries may collaborate to improve their standing, and capacity constraints may arise due to bandwidth limits.

While each of these variants has been previously studied alone, the combination of the two has not been previously considered. This is the focus of the present paper. Our main focus is on symmetric games, where all agents share the same source and sink nodes. Interestingly, the combination of coalitions and capacities gives rise to new phenomena that do not occur in any of the previous variants.

Example 1 [Equilibrium existence]. In the plain setting (i.e., with no capacities or coalitions), the profile in which all agents use the lowest-cost path from the source to the sink is clearly a NE. Now consider the variants of coalitions and capacities. The profile just mentioned is clearly a SE as well, as no coalition can benefit by deviating from the lowest-cost path. As for capacities, while capacity constraints may limit the use of the lowest-cost path, it has been proven that every (feasible) capacitated game admits a NE, due to the existence of an exact potential function [8]. Consider next the combination of coalitions and capacities. Here, even the mere existence problem becomes non-trivial. Consider, for example, the game depicted in Figure 1, played by two agents. In our figures we use the notation (x, y) to denote an edge with cost x and capacity y. One can easily verify that in this game, the unique NE (up to renaming of agents) is one where one agent uses the upper edge (a) at cost 1, and the other agent uses the path b, c at cost 1.3. However, this profile is not a SE, as the two agents can deviate to the paths b, c and b, d, respectively, at the respective costs of 0.7 and 1.1. Since every SE is also a NE, and the only NE is not a SE, we conclude that this game does not admit a SE.

Example 2 [Efficiency loss]. As another example, consider the efficiency loss incurred due to strategic behavior. The standard measure used to quantify the efficiency loss is the price of anarchy (PoA), defined as the ratio between the cost of the worst-case NE and the optimal cost (where the social cost is defined as the overall cost of the edges in use). In the plain game, it has been shown that the PoA can be as bad as n (i.e., the number of agents), and this is tight [4]. The consideration of coalitions significantly reduces the loss; in fact, every SE is optimal. In capacitated games, the

		SPP and EP	SP	General
PoA	**Uncap.**	n	n	n
	Cap.	n	n	unbounded
SPoA	**Uncap.**	1	1	1
	Cap. (*)	H_n	n	unbounded
SPoS	**Cap. (*)**	H_n	$\Theta(n)$	unbounded

Table 1: A comparison between upper bounds for the PoA in different scenarios. Cap. and uncap. are shorthands for capacitated and uncapacitated. Our results are marked with an asterisk (*). All bounds are tight.

PoA depends on the network topology. For example, if the network topology adheres to a *series-parallel* structure (defined in Section 2.2), then the PoA is bounded by n. Do coalitions reduce the efficiency loss in capacitated games as in their uncapacitated counterparts? Interestingly, the answer is *no* for series-parallel networks, but the answer is affirmative for a smaller set of topologies. Once again, the combination of coalitions and capacities introduces interesting phenomena, and requires a more refined classification of network topologies than each variant alone (see more details below).

1.1 Our Results

Equilibrium existence. As mentioned above, not all symmetric capacitated cost-sharing games admit a SE. We provide a full characterization of network topologies that do admit a SE; i.e., every game played on a topology in this class admits a SE, and for every topology not in this class, there exists a game that does not possess a SE. The analysis of this part requires the introduction of a new class of networks, which we refer to as *Series of Parallel Paths* (SPP) networks. This class is defined as all networks that are the concatenation of parallel-path networks.

Efficiency loss. Previous analysis of the efficiency loss in cost-sharing games showed that the network topology significantly affects the incurred loss. This observation is reinforced in this work, as summarized below (see also Table 1 for a subset of our results). We provide tight bounds on the strong price of anarchy (SPoA), defined as the ratio between the cost of the worst-case SE and the optimal cost and on the strong price of stability (SPoS), defined analogously with respect to the best-case SE.

Epstein et al. [7] establish an upper bound of H_n (i.e., the n^{th} harmonic number, which is roughly $\log(n)$) on the SPoA in every game (including asymmetric games) that admits a SE. As mentioned above, this result does not carry over to capacitated networks. However, we show that this result does carry over to a specific class of network topologies, namely extension-parallel (EP) and SPP networks. Moreover, we provide an example showing that this bound is tight. In series-parallel (SP) networks, the SPoA is at most n (follows from the upper bound on the PoA), and we provide an example showing that this is tight. For general networks, we show that the SPoA can be arbitrarily high, even in instances with only two agents. Interestingly, our analysis results in a more refined classification of topologies than was required for the study of capacities or coalitions alone, most notably in the distinction between subclasses of SP networks.

In addition, we provide bounds on the SPoS. We show that the SPoS can also be as high as $\Omega(n)$ in SP networks and is unbounded in general networks. Interestingly, while the PoS is significantly

better than the PoA (1 versus n in uncapacitated games, and an even wider gap in capacitated games), in capacitated games we show that for all the topology classes we consider, the bounds on the SPoS and SPoA are asymptotically the same. A natural interpretation of the PoS measure is the loss that is incurred if there exists a coordinator who can suggest an initial configuration to the agents. While a coordinator can sometimes reduce the efficiency loss, our results here imply that a coordinator may not be useful in the worst case.

In addition to studying games with arbitrary capacity constraints, we consider the special case in which all the edges have the same capacity. We show that limiting the capacities to be homogeneous reduces the efficiency loss in games played on EP networks, in which every SE becomes a socially optimal solution.

Extensions. We consider two natural extensions to our model. First, we consider asymmetric games. Here, we provide a characterization of network topologies that always admit a SE, and provide an example of a simple EP network for which the SPoA is unbounded. Second, we show that all of our results regarding symmetric games extend to undirected networks as well.

1.2 Related Work

Cost-sharing connection games were introduced by Anshelevich et al. [4], and have been widely studied since. The fair cost-sharing mechanism has been studied in [3]. A key property of fair cost-sharing games is the fact that they admit an exact potential function and thus possess a pure strategy NE [15, 16]. Settings with coalitions in congestion games have been studied by Holzman and Law-Yone [10, 11], and Epstein et al. [7] studied the existence and quality of SE in cost-sharing games. The characterization of network topologies that admit SE in congestion games with monotone cost functions has been later established in [12]. The PoA measure has been introduced by Koutsoupias and Papadimitriou [13] to study the quality of NE in games. The analogue of the PoA with respect to SE (called the strong PoA) was introduced and analyzed by Andelman et al. [2]. The SPoA in cost-sharing games was studied in [1, 7], and was also studied with respect to various additional settings; see, e.g., [6, 9]. The consideration of capacities in cost-sharing games was first suggested by Feldman and Ron [8].

2 Model and Preliminaries

2.1 Symmetric Capacitated Cost-Sharing Games

A symmetric capacitated cost-sharing (CCS) connection game is given by a tuple

$$\Delta = (n, G = (V, E), s, t, \{p_e\}_{e \in E}, \{c_e\}_{e \in E})$$

where n is the number of agents, $G = (V, E)$ is a directed graph, $s, t \in V$ are the source and sink nodes (respectively), and each edge $e \in E$ is associated with a cost $p_e \in \mathbf{R}^{\geq 0}$ and a capacity constraint $c_e \in \mathbf{N} \cup \{0\}$. Each agent wishes to construct an s-t path in G while maintaining minimal cost. The strategy space of agent i, denoted by Σ_i, is the set of all s-t paths in G. The joint strategy space is denoted by $\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \times \ldots \times \Sigma_n$.

Given a strategy profile $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in \Sigma$, the number of agents that use an edge e in the profile s is denoted by $x_e(s) = |\{i | e \in s_i\}|$. A profile s is said to be feasible if for every $e \in E$, $x_e(s) \leq c_e$. A game is said to be feasible if it admits a feasible strategy profile. Throughout this

paper we consider feasible games. When all the edges have the same capacity, we say that the game has homogeneous capacities. Formally, in games with homogeneous capacities, there is a number $c \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for every $e \in E$, $c_e = c$.

For a given strategy profile s and a coalition C, the induced strategy profile on the agents of the coalition C is denoted by s_C, and the strategy profile of the rest of the agents is denoted by s_{-C}. We consider the fair cost-sharing mechanism, where the cost of each edge is shared equally between all the agents who use it. The cost of agent i in a strategy profile s is

$$p_i(s) = \begin{cases} \sum_{e \in s_i} \frac{p_e}{x_e(s)} & \text{if } s \text{ is feasible} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We use the utilitarian objective function, that is, the social cost of a strategy profile s is the sum of costs of all agents, $cost(s) = \sum_i p_i(s)$.

A strategy profile s is a Nash equilibrium (NE) if no agent can improve her cost by deviating to another strategy, i.e., for every i and every strategy $s'_i \in \Sigma_i$, it holds that $p_i(s) \leq p_i(s'_i, s_{-i})$ (where s_{-i} denotes the strategy profile of all agents except i in s). A strong equilibrium (SE) is a strategy profile in which no coalition can deviate jointly in a way that will strictly decrease the cost of every coalition member. Formally, a profile s is a SE if for every coalition of agents C and every set of strategies $s'_C \in \Sigma_C$, there exists an agent $j \in C$ such that $p_j(s) \leq p_j(s'_C, s_{-C})$. The sets of NE and SE of a game Δ are denoted by $NE(\Delta)$ and $SE(\Delta)$, respectively.

We use the price of anarchy (PoA) and price of stability (PoS) measures to quantify the efficiency loss incurred due to strategic behavior. Let s^* be a strategy profile with minimal social cost in a game Δ. Then, the PoA of Δ is the ratio between the cost of the worst-case NE and the cost of s^*, namely $PoA = \max_{s \in NE(\Delta)} \frac{cost(s)}{cost(s^*)}$. Similarly, the PoS is the ratio between the cost of the best-case NE and the cost of s^*, namely $PoS = \min_{s \in NE(\Delta)} \frac{cost(s)}{cost(s^*)}$. The analogues of the PoA and PoS with respect to SE are named the strong price of anarchy (SPoA) and strong price of stability (SPoS). Formally, $SPoA = \max_{s \in SE(\Delta)} \frac{cost(s)}{cost(s^*)}$ and $SPoS = \min_{s \in SE(\Delta)} \frac{cost(s)}{cost(s^*)}$. For a family of games, these measures are defined with respect to the worst case over all the games in the family.

2.2 Graph Theoretic Preliminaries

A symmetric network is a graph $G = (V, E)$ with two designated nodes, a source $s \in V$ and a sink $t \in V$. We hereby present three important operations on symmetric graphs.

- Identification: Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, the identification of two nodes $v_1, v_2 \in V$ yields a new graph $G' = (V', E')$, where $V' = (V \cup \{v\}) \backslash \{v_1, v_2\}$ and E' includes all the edges of E, where each edge that was connected to v_1 or v_2 is now connected to v instead. Figuratively, the identification operation is the collapse of two nodes into one.

- Series composition: Given two symmetric networks, $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ with $s_1, t_1 \in V_1$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ with $s_2, t_2 \in V_2$, the series composition $G = G_1 \to G_2$ is the network formed by identifying t_1 and s_2 in the union network $G' = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2)$. In the composed network G, the new source is s_1 and the new sink is t_2.

- Parallel composition: Given two symmetric networks, $G_1 = (V_1, E_1)$ with $s_1, t_1 \in V_1$ and $G_2 = (V_2, E_2)$ with $s_2, t_2 \in V_2$, the parallel composition $G = G_1 \parallel G_2$ is the network formed



Figure 2: A game with no SE played on a Braess graph

by identifying the nodes s_1 and s_2 (forming a new source s) and the nodes t_1 and t_2 (forming a new sink t) in the union network $G' = (V_1 \cup V_2, E_1 \cup E_2)$.

The following are classes of network topologies that will be of interest throughout the paper:

- A network $G = (V, E)$ is a series-parallel (SP) network if it consists of a single edge, or if there are two SP networks G_1, G_2 such that $G = G_1 \to G_2$ or $G = G_1 \parallel G_2$.
- A network $G = (V, E)$ is an extension-parallel (EP) network if one of the following applies: (i) G consists of a single edge, (ii) There are two EP networks G_1, G_2 such that $G = G_1 \parallel G_2$, (iii) There is an EP network G_1 and an edge e such that $G = G_1 \to e$ or $G = e \to G_1$.

Finally, we have to define when a network is embedded in another network. A symmetric network G is embedded in a network G' if G' is isomorphic to G or to a network derived from G using any number of the following operations: (i) Subdivision (replacing an edge (u, v) by a new node w and two edges (u, w) and (w, v)), (ii) Addition of a new edge connecting two existing nodes (including nodes that were added using subdivision or extension), (iii) Extension (adding a new source or sink node and an edge connecting the new node with the original source or sink node, respectively).

3 Existence of Strong Equilibria

Every symmetric cost-sharing game admits a SE, as all agents can share the lowest-cost s-t path [7]. In the capacitated version, it has been shown by Feldman and Ron [8] that a pure NE exists in every feasible game, by establishing that the game admits a potential function. Therefore, the consideration of capacities or coalitions alone does not preclude the existence of an equilibrium. However, as was already observed in the introduction (recall Figure 1), capacitated games may not admit any SE, even in a simple EP graph.

An additional example of a game that does not admit a SE is depicted in Figure 2, on an underlying network known as a Braess graph. It is not difficult to verify that a game with two agents played on this graph does not admit any SE either.

As it turns out, the two networks depicted in Figures 1 and 2 are, roughly speaking, the only barriers to SE existence. This is formalized in the remainder of this section as an exact characterization of the network topologies that always admit a SE. We first introduce a new family of network topologies.

Definition 3.1. A symmetric network G is said to be *Series of Parallel Paths* (SPP) if there exist networks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$, each constructed by a parallel composition of simple paths, such that $G = G_1 \to \ldots \to G_k$.

Algorithm 1 Compute a SE for a network of parallel edges

1. $j \leftarrow 1$
2. For every edge e that has not been assigned agents yet, let its *fractional cost* be $\frac{p_e}{\min\{c_e, n-\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} n_i\}}$.
3. Assign the edge e with the minimal fractional cost to $n_j = \min\{c_e, n - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} n_i\}$ agents.
4. If there are agents that have not been assigned edges, increment j and go back to step 2.

Note that every SPP network is an SP network, but may or may not be an EP network.

Definition 3.2. A symmetric network G is said to admit a SE if *every* symmetric CCS game played on G admits a SE.

Recall that a symmetric network is defined as a graph with designated source and sink nodes. According to the last definition, a network G is said to admit a SE if *every* CCS game played on G (i.e., for every assignment of costs and capacities to the edges, and for every number of agents) admits a SE. Conversely, a network G does not admit a SE if there exists an example of a game played on G that does not admit a SE. The following theorem establishes the characterization of networks that admit a SE.

Theorem 3.3. *A network G admits a SE if and only if G is an SPP network.*

The proof is divided into two parts. In Theorem 3.4 we prove that every SPP network admits a SE, and in Theorem 3.6 we establish the converse direction.

Theorem 3.4. *Every SPP network admits a SE.*

Proof. We first observe that in our context, networks of parallel paths can be reduced to networks of parallel edges, where each path is replaced by an edge with capacity that equals the minimal capacity on the path and cost that equals the total cost of the path. Therefore, it suffices to prove the assertion of the theorem for networks constructed by series composition of parallel-edge graphs.

Let $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ be parallel-edge networks, and let G be a series composition of these networks. Algorithm 1 computes a strategy profile for games played on parallel-edge networks. The algorithm first computes the lowest-cost path in the network, and assigns it to n_1 agents (n_1 is calculated by the algorithm). In the j^{th} iteration, the lowest-cost path that is still available is determined, and assigned to n_j agents (n_j is calculated by the algorithm). Since the game is symmetric, Algorithm 1 is only concerned with the number of the agents (denoted n_j) and not with their identity. After the number of agents that use each edge is decided, the actual agents can be assigned strategies. The algorithm terminates within at most n steps. In this proof, we show that the returned profile is a SE. For every $i = 1, \ldots, k$, we compute a profile s_i for network G_i using Algorithm 1. Since the game is symmetric we may reorder the agents in an increasing order of their costs, namely, for every profile s_i, we order the agents so that for every $j < j'$, $p_j(s_i) \leq p_{j'}(s_i)$.

Let s be the strategy profile in which the strategy of agent j is the concatenation of his strategies in $s_1, \ldots, s_k$. Since we sorted each of the profiles s_i, the first agent in s uses the lowest-cost path in



Figure 3: Minimal non-SPP networks

each of $G_1, \ldots, G_k$, the next agent uses the second lowest-cost path, and so on. We wish to prove that s is a SE. Assume that there is a coalition C for which there is a profitable deviation, yielding a strategy profile s'. Let j be the minimal index of an agent in C, i.e., j is the agent that uses the j^{th} lowest-cost path in each of $s_1, \ldots, s_k$.

In order for s' to be a profitable deviation, j must reduce his cost in one of $G_1, \ldots, G_k$. Assume, without loss of generality, that by deviating to s', agent j reduces his cost in G_1. Denote the edge used by j in s_1 by e. There exists an edge e' such that

$$\frac{p_{e'}}{x_{e'}(s')} < \frac{p_e}{x_e(s)}.$$

The edge e' cannot be one of the edges entirely used in the profile s_1. If e' is an edge that is not used in s_1, it holds that $x_{e'}(s') \leq \min\{c_{e'}, n-j+1\}$. If e' is partially used in s_1, either $e' = e$ (in that case, $x_{e'}(s') \leq x_e(s)$, and j cannot reduce his cost) or $x_{e'}(s') \leq \min\{c_{e'}, n-j+1\}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{p_{e'}}{\min\{c_{e'}, n-j+1\}} < \frac{p_e}{x_e(s)}$$

and the algorithm should have assigned e' to agent j (or a previous agent) instead of e. We get a contradiction, thus, s is a SE. □

We now prove the converse direction, namely that for every non-SPP network, there is a CCS game played on it that does not admit a SE. The key lemma in our proof connects us back to the two examples mentioned in the beginning of this section. The proof is deferred to Appendix B.

Lemma 3.5. *A network is SPP if and only if it does not embed any of the networks depicted in Figure 3.*

Using Lemma 3.5 we can now prove the following. The proof is similar to that of a lemma proven in [8], and is specified here for completeness.

Theorem 3.6. *For every non-SPP network G, there exists a symmetric CCS game played on G that does not admit a SE.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.5, if G is not an SPP network, it must embed one of the networks depicted in Figure 3. We define a game of two agents played on G. We start from one of the networks presented in Figure 3 and assign costs and capacities as in Figures 1 and 2. The network G is derived from the forbidden network using the operations: subdivision, addition, and extension. We show how to assign costs and capacities to the edges that are added in the process so that each strategy profile in the new game corresponds to a strategy profile in the original game that does not admit a SE.

Formally, let Δ be a CCS game played on a network G, and let G' be a network derived from G by applying one of the operations: subdivision, addition, or extension. We construct a game Δ'

played on G' that emulates Δ: We define a bijection f from the strategy space of an agent in Δ to the strategy space of an agent in Δ', such that $(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ is feasible whenever $(f(s_1), \ldots, f(s_n))$ is feasible, and $p_i(s_1, \ldots, s_n) = p_i(f(s_1), \ldots, f(s_n))$ for every strategy profile $(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$. We do not need to define different mappings between strategy spaces for different agents, as we consider symmetric games and the strategy spaces of the agents are identical. We define Δ' and the function f for each one of the possible operations:

- Subdivision: If an edge e is subdivided into e_1 and e_2, we set $c_{e_1} = c_{e_2} = c_e$, $p_{e_1} = p_e$, and $p_{e_2} = 0$. Given a strategy s_i in Δ, $f(s_i)$ is the same path as s_i where the edge e is replaced by the path (e_1, e_2) (if $e \notin s_i$, $f(s_i) = s_i$). No strategy profile in Δ' can use only one of e_1, e_2, so f is a bijection.
- Addition: If an edge e connecting two existing nodes is added, we set its capacity to be $c_e = 0$, and define $f(s_i) = s_i$ for every strategy s_i. No strategy in Δ' can use the new edge, so f is a bijection.
- Extension: If the source or the sink are extended using a new edge e, we set $c_e = n$ and $p_e = 0$. Given a strategy s_i, $f(s_i)$ uses the newly added edge e concatenated to the path used in s_i. Every strategy in Δ' must use the new edge e, concatenated to a path in Δ, so f is a bijection.

We claim that Δ' does not admit a SE if and only if Δ does not admit a SE. Let s, s' be strategy profiles in Δ, and let C be a coalition. The profile $(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n)$ is a profitable deviation from $(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ for C in Δ, if and only if the profile $(f(s'_1), \ldots, f(s'_n))$ is a profitable deviation from the profile $(f(s_1), \ldots, f(s_n))$ for C in Δ'. □

This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.3.

4 Strong Price of Anarchy

4.1 EP and SPP Networks

In this section we bound the strong price of anarchy (SPoA) in capacitated games that admit SE. The following theorem establishes an upper bound on the SPoA for EP networks.

Theorem 4.1. *For every symmetric CCS game played on an EP network, it holds that $SPoA \leq H_n$ (if a SE exists).*

Epstein et al. [7] showed that $SPoA \leq H_n$ for uncapacitated cost-sharing games. In their proof, they used the fact that no coalition can beneficially deviate from a strategy profile s that is a SE (by definition). In particular, if some coalition C deviates to its corresponding profile in the socially optimal profile s^*, then one of the agents in C weakly prefers the initial profile s to the new profile (s^*_C, s_{-C}). The desired bound is then derived by the obtained inequalities for coalitions of sizes $n, \ldots, 1$. The only barrier to applying the exact same technique to capacitated games is the fact that the deviation into profile (s^*_C, s_{-C}) might be infeasible due to capacity constraints. Our key lemma in this section shows that for games played on EP networks there always exists such a feasible deviation. Note that there may be more than a single socially optimal profile, but we have the freedom to choose one of them to be s^*.

Lemma 4.2. *Let G be an EP network and s be a SE in a symmetric CCS game played on G. There exists a feasible strategy profile s^* such that the cost of s^* is minimal, and for every coalition C, the profile (s^*_C, s_{-C}) is feasible.*

The following lemma, which is due to Feldman and Ron [8], will be used in the proof.

Lemma 4.3. *[8] Let G be an SP network. Let s be a feasible profile of k agents in a game played on G, and let s' be a feasible profile of r agents such that $r < k$. There exists an $s-t$ path in G that is feasible in s' and uses only edges that are used in the profile s.*

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let G_{OPT} be the subnetwork that contains only the edges that are used by an optimal strategy profile, and let N denote the set of agents. We first define a specific profile s^* played on G_{OPT}, and then prove that for every coalition C, the strategy profile (s^*_C, s_{-C}) is feasible. Since G is EP, G_{OPT} is also EP. We define s^* in two steps: First, we assign a strategy to as many agents as possible using recursion (on the structure of G_{OPT}). Then, we use Lemma 4.3 to extend this set of strategies to a profile of all agents. The profile s^* is defined using Algorithm 2, which chooses a specific profile from all the optimal strategy profiles. The algorithm gets as input the subnetwork G_{OPT} that is used by an optimal profile and the strategy profile s, which is a SE.

It is important to note that the algorithm might possibly define a strategy profile only for a subset of the agents. In step 2, $N_1 \cap N_2 = \phi$, but it is possible that $N_1 \cup N_2 \subset N$ (since G_{OPT} is a subnetwork of G). Therefore, by the end of step 2, it is possible that not all the agents in N are assigned a strategy. In step 3(c), it is also possible that not the agents in N will be assigned a strategy. Thus, we have to extend this strategy profile to a feasible profile for all agents (using only edges from G_{OPT}). We do so by applying Lemma 4.3 to the network G_{OPT}, where s is any strategy profile that uses only edges from G_{OPT}, and s' is the partial profile that was defined above. This provides a full definition of the profile s^*. An example of the definition of s^* appears in Appendix A.

We claim that the profile s^* satisfies the capacity constraints. In step 1 of the algorithm, an edge is assigned to the same agents that use it in the feasible profile s (due to the way N is split in step 2). In step 3, the edge e is used only by agents that use it in s, and edges in G_1 are assigned in a way that satisfies the capacity constraints. Therefore, no edge exceeds its capacity.

Let C be a coalition of agents. We wish to prove that the strategy profile $s_{comb} = (s_C, s^*_{-C})$ is feasible. Let e be an edge. Let M denote the set of agents that use e in s, and let M^* denote the set of agents that use e in s^*. The set of agents that use e in s_{comb} is $(M \cap C) \cup (M^* \cap (N \backslash C))$. If e is used only in s, it cannot exceed its capacity in s_{comb}, since $M \cap C \subseteq M$, and the profile s is feasible. The same applies to edges that are used only in s^*. It remains to consider edges that are used in both s and s^*. There are two types of edges in EP networks: ones that are added to the graph through an extension of the source or sink, and all other edges. The algorithm assigns edges of the former type to agents in step 3, and edges of the latter type in step 1.

If edge e is used in both s and s^*, there are two cases:

Case 1: If e is assigned agents in step 1 of the algorithm, then the set N in this step contains all the agents that use e in s, namely, $M \subseteq N$, thus, $M \subseteq M^*$ ($e \in s_i \Rightarrow e \in s^*_i$). The set of agents that use e in s_{comb} is $(M \cap C) \cup (M^* \cap (N \backslash C)) \subseteq M^*$. Since s^* is feasible, then e does not exceed its capacity in s_{comb}.

Case 2: If e is added to the network G_{OPT} using extension of the source or the sink, the algorithm assigns e to agents in step 3. There are two cases. In step 3(c), if each agent that uses e in s was assigned a path in G_1 in s^*, we get that $M \subseteq M^*$. The set of agents that use e in s_{comb} is $(M \cap C) \cup (M^* \cap (N \backslash C)) \subseteq M^*$. Since s^* is feasible, we get that e does not exceed its capacity in

Algorithm 2 Choosing the optimal profile s^*

Input: G_{OPT} is a graph, N is a set of agents, and s is a strategy profile.
ChooseOptimalProfile(G_{OPT}, N, s):

1. If $G_{OPT} = e$, where e is a single edge, return a strategy profile in which the edge e is assigned to all the agents in N who use e in s.
2. If $G_{OPT} = G_1 \parallel G_2$:
   (a) Let $N_i \subseteq N$ be the set of agents that use an edge of G_i $(i = 1, 2)$.
   (b) $s_1 \leftarrow ChooseOptimalProfile(G_1, N_1, s)$
   (c) $s_2 \leftarrow ChooseOptimalProfile(G_2, N_2, s)$
   (d) Return the union of the profiles: (s_1, s_2).
3. If $G_{OPT} = G_1 \rightarrow e$ or $G_{OPT} = e \rightarrow G_1$, where e is an edge:
   (a) $s_1 \leftarrow ChooseOptimalProfile(G_1, N, s)$
   (b) Each agent that has a strategy in s_1 will also use the edge e.
   (c) For any other agent that uses e in s, attempt to find an available path in G_1. If found, assign it together with the edge e to the agent.
   (d) Return the profile that was defined in the last three steps.
   - In case it is possible to represent G_{OPT} as both $G_1 \rightarrow e_1$ and $e_2 \rightarrow G_2$, choose the representation in which the edge e_i is used by the maximal set of agents in s.

s_{comb}. The second case is that there is an agent that uses e in s but does not use e and G_1 in s^*. Due to the definition of s^*, there is no available path in G_1. Therefore, no agent can be assigned a path in G_1 later. Each agent that uses e in s^* must use G_1. Hence, no agents will be assigned the edge e after it is used in step 3 of the algorithm. Thus, $M^* \subseteq M$. The set of agents that use e in s_{comb} is $(M \cap C) \cup (M^* \cap (N \backslash C)) \subseteq M$. Since s is feasible, then e does not exceed its capacity in s_{comb}.

We conclude that no edge exceeds its capacity in s_{comb}; the assertion of Theorem 4.1 follows. □

Remark. Let $c_{max} = \max_{e \in E} c_e$ be the maximal capacity of an edge. In the case of capacitated games, the bound of H_n on the SPoA that was established in [7] can be slightly improved to $H_{c_{max}}$. In their proof, Epstein et al. used the potential function to bound the cost of every SE. For a SE s and an optimal solution s^*, they have shown that $cost(s) \leq \Phi(s^*)$, where the potential function Φ is defined by $\Phi(s) = \sum_{e \in E} p_e \cdot H_{x_e(s)}$ (where $x_e(s)$ is the number of agents who use edge e in s). When capacity constraints are added, in every feasible profile s it holds that $x_e(s) \leq c_{max}$. Therefore, we can bound the cost of every SE by $\Phi(s^*) \leq \sum_{e \in E} p_e \cdot H_{c_{max}} = H_{c_{max}} \cdot cost(s^*)$.

The following theorem extends the class of networks for which the SPoA is bounded by H_n.

Theorem 4.4. *For every symmetric CCS game played on a network that is a series composition of EP networks, it holds that SPoA $\leq H_n$ (if a SE exists), and this bound is tight.*



Figure 4: A game played on an SP network with $SPoA = n$

Proof. Let $G = G_1 \to G_2 \to \ldots \to G_k$ be a network. It is sufficient to prove that the SPoA of a game played on G is upper bounded by the maximal SPoA of a game played on one of the subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$. Denote by $cost_{G_i}(s)$ the social cost of the strategy profile s in a game played only on the subnetwork G_i, and let s^* be an optimal profile. For every strategy profile s, it holds that

$$cost_G(s) = cost_{G_1}(s) + \ldots + cost_{G_k}(s).$$

If s is a SE in G, the induced strategy profile in G_i is also a SE. We get that

$$\begin{aligned} SPoA(G) &= \max_{s \text{ is SE}} \frac{cost_G(s)}{cost_G(s^*)} \\ &= \max_{s \text{ is SE}} \frac{cost_{G_1}(s) + \ldots + cost_{G_k}(s)}{cost_{G_1}(s^*) + \ldots + cost_{G_k}(s^*)} \\ &\leq \max_{s \text{ is SE}} \max_i \frac{cost_{G_i}(s)}{cost_{G_i}(s^*)} \\ &\leq \max_i SPoA(G_i). \end{aligned}$$

Feldman and Ron [8] show an example of a game with n agents, in which the PoS is $\frac{H_n}{1+\epsilon}$ for every $\epsilon > 0$. The only NE in that example is also a SE. This shows that the upper bound of H_n on the SPoA in EP networks is tight. □

Note that SPP networks are a special case of the class specified in the last theorem, and therefore the upper bound of H_n applies to SPP networks as well.

4.2 SP and General Networks

For SP networks, it is established in [8] that $PoA \leq n$, which directly implies that $SPoA \leq n$. We provide an example showing that this bound is tight.

Theorem 4.5. *For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an SP network G and a CCS game played on G such that $SPoA \geq \frac{n}{1+\epsilon}$.*

Proof. Consider the game played by n agents on the graph depicted in Figure 4. It is easy to verify that the strategy profile in which each agent uses one edge of cost 1 (and $n-1$ additional edges of cost 0) is a SE. The optimal profile in this game is the profile where one agent uses the lower edge of cost $1+\epsilon$ and $n-1$ agents use the upper edges of cost 0. It follows that $SPoA \geq \frac{n}{1+\epsilon}$, as stated. □

For general networks, the SPoA can be arbitrarily high, even with only two agents.



Figure 5: A game with unbounded SPoA

Theorem 4.6. *For every real number R, there exists a CCS game with two agents in which the SPoA is greater than R.*

Proof. Consider the game played by two agents on the graph presented in Figure 5. One can easily verify that the strategy profile in which no agent uses the inner edges is a SE. However, the optimal strategy profile will avoid the edge of cost $24R$. Thus, $SPoA \geq \frac{24R+5}{24} > R$. □

4.3 Homogeneous Capacities

We consider a more restricted form of capacity constraints, in which all the edges have the same capacity. In this special case, we show that every SE in games played on an EP network is optimal.

Theorem 4.7. *For every feasible symmetric CCS game with homogeneous capacities played on an EP network, it holds that $SPoA = 1$.*

Proof. Let Δ be a feasible symmetric game played on an EP network G, and denote by c the capacity of the edges. We wish to show that every SE in Δ is optimal. We first show that there is a game that is played on a network of parallel edges, such that every SE in that game is optimal if and only if every SE in Δ is optimal. Let $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ be EP networks such that $G = G_1 \parallel G_2 \parallel \ldots \parallel G_k$, and none of $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ can be represented as a parallel composition of two networks. Since G_i is an EP network, and cannot be decomposed into two parallel subnetworks, G_i must be a single edge or an EP network that is extended by a single edge. It follows that in every strategy profile, no more than c agents can use edges that belong to G_i. If G_i is a single edge, its capacity is c, and if G_i is an EP network extended by a single edge e, every agent that uses edges from G_i must also use e, which has a capacity of c agents.

Next, we claim that in every SE, all the agents that use edges from G_i use the same path, which is the lowest-cost path in G_i (if there is more than one path with minimal cost, one of these paths will be shared by all the agents). If there are agents who use a path of higher cost in G_i, they can deviate to the lowest-cost path and reduce their costs. This deviation satisfies the capacity constraints, as at most c agents use edges from G_i, and the capacity of all the edges in the path is c.

Using the last observation, we can look at a different game, that is played on a network of parallel edges, and that every SE in Δ corresponds to a SE in the new game. For each of $G_1, \ldots, G_k$, we compute the minimal cost of an s-t path that goes through that subnetwork, and replace the subnetwork with an edge that has that cost and a capacity of c agents. Given a SE in the original game, we construct a strategy profile for the new game, such that the agents who use the minimal cost path in G_i will use the edge that replaced G_i in the new network. The costs of these two strategy profiles are the same for each agent.

It is only left to show that when all the capacities are equal, every SE in a game played on a network of parallel edges is optimal. Let s be a SE in a game played on a network of parallel edges, where the capacity of each edge is c. Denote by e the edge that has the maximal cost of all the edges that are used in s. Assume (by contradiction) that there is another edge e', such that $p_{e'} < p_e$ (e' is cheaper) and $x_{e'}(s) < c$ (e' is available). The number of agents who can deviate from e to e' is at most $\min\{x_e(s), c - x_{e'}(s)\}$. If this number of agents deviate to e', their cost will reduce from $\frac{p_e}{x_e(s)}$ to at most $\frac{p_{e'}}{x_e(s)}$. This contradicts our assumption that s is a SE. Therefore, every SE uses $\left\lceil \frac{n}{c} \right\rceil$ edges of minimal total cost, as does the optimal solution. We conclude that $SPoA = 1$. □

By applying the same arguments used in the proof of Theorem 4.4, the last result can be extended to every network that is a series composition of EP networks, particularly, SPP networks.

Corollary 4.8. *For every feasible symmetric CCS game with homogeneous capacities, that is played on a network that is a series composition of EP networks, it holds that $SPoA = 1$.*

When considering more general networks, limiting the capacities to be homogeneous does not improve the SPoA. In the example presented in the proof of Theorem 4.5, which shows that the SPoA in SP networks can be arbitrarily close to n, we can replace each edge that costs 0 with $n-1$ parallel edges that cost 0 and have unit capacity. This way all the edges have unit capacity, and the theorem still holds for homogeneous capacities. In the example that shows that the SPoA can be unbounded (in non-SP networks), all the edges already have unit capacities.

5 Strong Price of Stability

In some cases, the best SE may be of interest as well. For example, if there exists a central entity that can coordinate the agents around an initial equilibrium. Clearly, it always holds that $PoS \leq SPoS \leq SPoA$ (since $SE(\Delta) \subseteq NE(\Delta)$), so the upper bounds on the SPoA apply to the SPoS as well. Interestingly, the upper bounds on the SPoS in all the classes of network topologies considered here match the upper bounds on the SPoA. This is in stark contrast to previous settings, which exhibited large gaps between worst-case and best-case equilibria. In what follows, we show that all the upper bounds on the SPoA established in the previous section are tight with respect to the best SE.

For EP and SPP networks, the bound of H_n is tight with respect to the best SE due to an example provided in [8], in which $PoS = \frac{H_n}{1+\epsilon}$ for every $\epsilon > 0$.

For SP networks, we have shown that $SPoA \leq n$, and the following theorem shows a game for which $SPoS = \Omega(n)$.

Theorem 5.1. *There exists a symmetric CCS game played on an SP network, in which the SPoS is at least $\Omega(n)$.*

Proof. Consider the game of n agents depicted in Figure 6. We divide the network into two parts. The first part, which we refer to as the upper part of the network, contains the paths that go from s to t through the nodes $v_1, \ldots, v_{n-2}$. In the upper subgraph, there are $n-1$ edges that cost 0 and $n-1$ edges that cost 1. The second part, which we refer to as the lower part of the network, contains the edge connecting s and t directly, and the two paths that go from s to t through node u. The upper part of the network can be used by at most $n-1$ agents, so one of the agents must use the lower part of the network.



Figure 6: A game played on an SP network with $SPoS = \Theta(n)$

We show that the only SE in this game are profiles in which each agent pays 1: $n-1$ agents use $n-2$ edges of cost 0 and one edge of cost 1, and the last agent uses the edge that goes directly from s to t and costs 1. First, we claim that such profiles are SE by considering the possibly profitable deviations. The only way an agent's cost can get lower than 1 is if the agent shares the edge (s, u) with another agent. However, such a deviation would require another agent to use a path that costs $1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, and that agent could not benefit from the deviation. Since there are no profitable deviations, the profiles are SE, and their social cost is n.

Now, we show that all other profiles are not SE. In every other profile in which only one agent uses the lower subgraph, one of the agents who use the upper part of the network pays at least 2. This agent can deviate to one of the lower paths and reduce her cost. Therefore, these profiles are not SE. Every profile in which there are two agents using the lower subgraph cannot be a SE either. In such profiles, the agents that use the upper part of the network will only use the edges that cost 0 and will not participate in any deviation. The remaining two agents always have a profitable deviation: In every NE, one of them will use the edge that costs 1. However, this agent's cost can be reduced by sharing the edge (s, u) with the other agent, so that one of them pays $\frac{1+\epsilon}{2}$ and the other pays $1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ instead of $1 + \epsilon$. It remains to prove that the profiles in which three agents use the lower subgraph are not SE, but these are not even NE, as one of the agents can benefit by deviating to a path consisting of edges of cost 0.

So far we have shown that the social cost of every SE is n. The optimal profile uses the edges that cost 0, and the two paths that go through node u. The social cost of this profile is $1.5 + \epsilon$, hence it holds that $SPoS = \frac{n}{1.5+\epsilon} = \Omega(n)$. □

Next, we show that in the case of non-SP networks, the SPoS can be unbounded (as shown for the SPoA).

Theorem 5.2. *There exists a symmetric CCS game in which the SPoS can be arbitrarily high.*

Proof. Consider the game of two agents presented in Figure 7. The following strategy profile is a SE: One agent uses the path (s, e, c, d, b, t) and incurs the cost 0.6, and the other agent uses the path (s, a, b, t) and incurs the cost $R + 1.3$. This is a SE since the first agent incurs the minimal possible cost, and the other agent uses the only available path. We claim that this is the only SE.

In every NE, it is impossible that two agents will use the edge (s, a), as one of them incurs a cost of at least 1.1, and therefore may deviate to the path (s, e, t). Hence, one agent must use the edge (s, a) and the other must use the edge (s, e).



Figure 7: A game with unbounded SPoS

If one agent uses the path (s, e, t), using the path (s, a, c, d, b, t) minimizes the cost of the other agent. This strategy profile is not a SE, as they can jointly deviate to the paths (s, a, b, t) and (s, a, c, d, t), respectively, and both agents will benefit from the deviation.

We obtain that in every SE one agent must use the path (s, e, c, d). This agent will not use the path (s, e, c, d, t), as he can use the better path (s, e, t). The agent will not use the edge that costs R for the same reason.

We conclude that the only SE is the one presented above. This SE uses the edge that costs R. An optimal strategy profile will avoid that edge, as R can be arbitrarily high. Therefore, the SPoS is unbounded, as stated. □

6 Extensions

6.1 Asymmetric Games

A natural extension of our model is the case of asymmetric games, where different agents are associated with different source and sink nodes. In this section we remark on the existence of SE and their quality in asymmetric games.

Regarding the existence of SE, Epstein et al. [7] provided an example of an asymmetric game played on an SPP network that does not admit a SE. The following two theorems provide a characterization of the networks that admit a SE: one theorem considers games with a single source and the other considers games with multiple source nodes. The proofs are deferred to Appendix B.

Theorem 6.1. *In single source games, a network G admits a SE if and only if it is SPP.*

Theorem 6.2. *In games with multiple source and sink nodes, a network G admits a SE if and only if there are networks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ such that $G = G_1 \to G_2 \to \ldots \to G_k$, and that one of $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ is a network of parallel paths and the rest are networks of parallel edges.*

Next we study the SPoA in asymmetric games. Unlike the symmetric case, which exhibited reasonable bounds for some families of topologies, in the asymmetric case, even if all agents share the same source (but not the same sink) and play a game on a simple EP network, the SPoA may be unbounded.

Example. Consider the game played by two agents that is presented in Figure 8. The source node of both agents is s, and the sink nodes are t_1 and t_2, respectively. The strategy profile in which agent 1 uses the edge of cost R and agent 2 uses the path of cost 0 is a SE. In the optimal profile,



Figure 8: An asymmetric game with unbounded SPoA

agent 1 uses the edge of cost 0, and agent 2 uses the edge of cost 1. Therefore, in this example $SPoA = R$, which can be arbitrarily high.

However, for the class of SPP networks, the SPoA is upper bounded by H_n, even for asymmetric games.

Theorem 6.3. *For every CCS game (either symmetric or asymmetric) played on an SPP network, it holds that $SPoA \leq H_n$ (if a SE exists).*

The proof is deferred to Appendix B.

6.2 Undirected Graphs

Up until now we considered the case of cost-sharing games played on a directed graphs. In this section we show that our results (for symmetric games) extend to undirected graphs.

For directed graphs we have shown that a network admits a SE if and only if it is an SPP network. Theorem 3.4 asserts that every SPP network admits a SE. To prove existence we use a greedy algorithm for assigning edges to agents, such that in every coalition, there must exist an agent that cannot reduce its cost in any subnetwork of parallel edges. It is easy to check that the same argument carries over to undirected graphs. In the converse direction, we presented two examples of games played on directed graphs that admit no SE. One can verify that these games admit no SE also in the case where the underlying graph is undirected. To complete the argument we note that the lemma that is used to extend these forbidden networks to networks that embed them applies to undirected graphs following an identical analysis.

For bounding the SPoA and the SPoS in EP and SP networks, we use the following claim.

Claim 6.4. *Let Δ be a symmetric CCS game played on a directed SP network G, and let Δ' be the same game played on the same network but with undirected edges. If s is a SE in Δ', then Δ has a SE with the same social cost as in s.*

Proof. Let s be a SE in Δ'. We first claim that we can assume, without loss of generality, that s uses only acyclic paths. To see this note that the paths in s cannot contain cycles that cost more than 0, as if one of them did, the agent using that path could reduce her cost by removing the cycle. In addition, it can be assumed that the paths in s do not contain cycles that cost 0, as removing these cycles does not affect the agent costs. To conclude the proof, we use the following lemma, established by Milchtaich [14].

Lemma 6.5. *[14] Let G be an undirected SP network, and let u, v be two distinct vertices in G. If there exists an acyclic s-t path in which u precedes v, then u precedes v in every acyclic s-t path that contains both vertices.*

By the above lemma, it follows that every edge used in the strategy profile s (in the game Δ') is used in the direction determined by G. Each edge (u, v) in the directed SP network G can be used as part of an acyclic path in G, and the lemma guarantees that if u, v are both reached in a path in s, u precedes v. Therefore, s is a valid strategy profile in Δ. Clearly, any deviation that is feasible in Δ is also feasible in Δ'; therefore the profile s is a SE in Δ as well. □

The above claim implies that the set of SE in the undirected case is a subset of the set of SE in the directed case (up to cycles of cost 0). Therefore, upper bounds on the SPoA in games played on directed SP networks carry over to the undirected case. In addition, it is easy to verify that the examples that are used to show that these upper bounds are tight (or that the SPoA can be unbounded in general networks) hold when the edges are undirected as well. In the case of games with homogeneous capacities that are played on EP and SPP networks, we have shown that every SE is optimal, and this result carries over to the undirected case (by the above claim).

The upper bounds on the SPoS are derived from the fact that $SPoS \leq SPoA$, and we have shown that these bounds are asymptotically tight. The examples that are used to show that these upper bounds are tight still hold when the edges are undirected, and the analysis of the game with unbounded SPoS appears in Appendix B. This completes the extension of our results for symmetric games to the case of undirected graphs.

Acknowledgments

Idan Nurick was involved in a preliminary version of this work. We would like to thank Nick Gravin for helpful discussions.

References

[1] Susanne Albers. On the value of coordination in network design. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 38(6):2273–2302, 2009.

[2] Nir Andelman, Michal Feldman, and Yishay Mansour. Strong price of anarchy. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA'07, pages 189–198, 2007.

[3] Elliot Anshelevich, Anirban Dasgupta, Jon Kleinberg, Éva Tardos, Tom Wexler, and Tim Roughgarden. The price of stability for network design with fair cost allocation. In *Proceedings of the 45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, FOCS'04, pages 295–304, 2004.

[4] Elliot Anshelevich, Anirban Dasgupta, Éva Tardos, and Tom Wexler. Near-optimal network design with selfish agents. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC'03, pages 511–520, 2003.

[5] Robert J. Aumann. Acceptable points in general cooperative n-person games. In A. W. Tucker and R. D. Luce, editors, *Contributions to the Theory of Games IV, Annals of Mathematical Study 40*, pages 287–324. Princeton University Press, 1959.

[6] Steve Chien and Alistair Sinclair. Strong and pareto price of anarchy in congestion games. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming: Part I*, ICALP'09, pages 279–291, 2009.

[7] Amir Epstein, Michal Feldman, and Yishay Mansour. Strong equilibrium in cost sharing connection games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 67(1):51–68, 2009.

[8] Michal Feldman and Tom Ron. Capacitated network design games. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory*, SAGT'12, pages 132–143, 2012.

[9] Amos Fiat, Haim Kaplan, Meital Levy, and Svetlana Olonetsky. Strong price of anarchy for machine load balancing. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Automata, Languages and Programming*, ICALP'07, pages 583–594, 2007.

[10] Ron Holzman and Nissan Law-Yone. Strong equilibrium in congestion games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 21(12):85 – 101, 1997.

[11] Ron Holzman and Nissan Law-Yone. Network structure and strong equilibrium in route selection games. *Mathematical Social Sciences*, 46(2):193 – 205, 2003.

[12] Ron Holzman and Dov Monderer. Strong equilibrium in network congestion games: increasing versus decreasing costs. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 2014.

[13] Elias Koutsoupias and Christos Papadimitriou. Worst-case equilibria. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, STACS'99, pages 404–413, 1999.

[14] Igal Milchtaich. Network topology and the efficiency of equilibrium. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 57(2):321–346, 2006.

[15] Dov Monderer and Lloyd S. Shapley. Potential games. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 14(1):124 – 143, 1996.

[16] Robert W. Rosenthal. A class of games possessing pure-strategy nash equilibria. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 2(1):65–67, 1973.

A An Example of Algorithm 2

Figure 9 provides an example that illustrates the definition of s^*. Recall that Algorithm 2 gets as input a SE (s) and the subnetwork that is used by an optimal strategy profile (G_{OPT}). The algorithm is used to choose an optimal profile s^* from all possible optimal strategy profiles that use only edges from G_{OPT}. Figure 9(a) shows the strategies of $n = 6$ agents in the profile s, which is a SE. Figures 9(b)-(d) show the construction of s^* over G_{OPT}. Figure 9(b) illustrates the case of parallel composition: The lower edge is used by agent 6 (as in profile s), and we use the algorithm recursively in order to find a profile for agents $1, \ldots, 5$ who use the upper subnetwork. Figure 9(c) shows the case of edge extension: The edge of cost 8 is a subnetwork that was extended with the edge of cost 5. The edge of cost 8 is used by the agents $1, 2, 3$ in s, hence it will be used by the same agents in s^*. The algorithm now defines which agents will use the edge of cost 5. First of all, it has to be used by agents $1, 2, 3$. We consider the rest of the agents that use this edge in s. One



Figure 9: An illustration of Algorithm 2

of them (agent 4) can use the edge of cost 8, and the other (agent 5) can not. Therefore, agent 4 is assigned the same path as agents $1, 2, 3$, and the strategy of agent 5 is left undefined. Figure 9(d) shows the final profile s^*, after it was extended to all agents using Lemma 4.3.

B Omitted Proofs

Proof of Lemma 3.5. First, note that none of the networks of Figure 3 is SPP, so if a network is SPP, it cannot embed any of these networks.

In the converse direction, assume that G is a network that does not embed any of the networks of Figure 3. We wish to prove that G is SPP. It is proven in [14] that a network is SP if and only if it does not embed a Braess graph (Figure 3(a)). Therefore, G is SP. The rest of the proof is by induction on the height of the construction tree of G.

Assume, by contradiction, that G is not SPP. Since G is SP, we know that either $G = G_1 \to G_2$ or $G = G_1 \parallel G_2$. By induction, we can assume that both G_1 and G_2 are SPP. It is impossible that $G = G_1 \to G_2$, because the series composition of two SPP networks is an SPP network. Hence, we get that $G = G_1 \parallel G_2$. If both of G_1, G_2 are networks of parallel paths, their parallel composition is a network of parallel paths, which is SPP. Therefore, one of G_1, G_2 embeds a series composition of a a single edge and a parallel-edge network. It follows that G embeds one of the networks presented in Figure 3(b)-(c). It is a contradiction, hence G is SPP. □

Proof of Theorem 6.1. One direction has already been proven in Section 3: For every non-SPP network, we have shown that there is a symmetric CCS game played on it that does not admit a SE. We now show that every single source game played on an SPP network admits a SE.

Let Δ be a single source game played on an SPP network G. We denote the common source

node by s and the sink node of agent j by t_j. By the definition of SPP networks, G is series composition of networks of parallel paths. Let $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ be networks of parallel paths such that $G = G_1 \to G_2 \to \ldots \to G_k$. For now, we assume that s is the source node of G_1.

Consider the sink node of agent j. That node must be either an inner node or a sink node of one of the subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$. Assume that t_j is an inner node or the sink of subnetwork G_i. Now let us look at a path from s to t_j. Since the graph is directed, any path from s to t_j does not use edges from subnetworks $G_{i+1}, \ldots, G_k$. In addition, any path from s to t_j can be divided into i subsequent parts. The first $i-1$ parts are paths from the source to the sink of each of the subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_{i-1}$. The last part is a path from the source node of G_i to t_j. If t_j is an inner node of G_i, there is only one path from the source of G_i to t_j.

We have seen that the sink node of an agent determines whether edges from a subnetwork G_i can be part of her path. Without loss of generality, we assume that the agents are ordered in a way that agents who use more subnetworks of $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ come first. Formally, for every two agents j_1, j_2, such that t_{j_1} is an inner node or the sink node of G_{i_1} and t_{j_2} is an inner node or the sink node of G_{i_2}, if $j_1 < j_2$, then: (i) $i_1 \geq i_2$, (ii) if t_{j_1} is an inner node and t_{j_2} is not an inner node, then $i_1 > i_2$.

Now we define a strategy profile r and show that it is a SE. The definition of the profile uses Algorithm 1 in a similar way to the proof of Theorem 3.4. The profile r is defined in two steps. First, if agent j's sink node is an inner node of subnetwork G_i, every path from s to t_j uses the same edges in G_i, so we assign these edges to the agent. This is only a part of agent j's path, and the rest of her path is determined in the next step. In the next step, we iterate through the subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$. When subnetwork G_i is considered, we determine how many agents need to be assigned a path from the source node to the sink node of G_i, and compute these paths using Algorithm 1. The algorithm is stated for edges, but as in the proof of Theorem 3.4, each path can be replaced by an equivalent edge that sums the costs of the edges in the path and has the minimal available capacity of these edges. Then, we assign each of the paths returned by the algorithm to the agents according to their order: The first agent j_1 who needs to be assigned a path in G_i gets the lowest-cost path returned by the algorithm. Then, the second agent $j_2 > j_1$ who needs a path in G_i is assigned the second lowest-cost path, and we continue the same way until all the paths returned by the algorithm are assigned. This completes the definition of r.

We claim that the strategy profile r is a SE. Assume by contradiction that there is a coalition C for which deviating to another profile is profitable, and let j be the minimal index of an agent in C. Agent j must reduce the cost that she pays for the edges in at least one of the subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$.

For each G_i, agent j can reduce her cost in G_i by moving to another path, or by sharing the cost of her path with another agent that deviates to that path. As in the proof of Theorem 3.4, agent j cannot use another path in a profitable deviation, as if there were such a path, the algorithm would have assigned that path to j earlier. So after the deviation, agent j must share her path in G_i with more agents compared to the original profile r. There are two cases.

Case 1: Agent j's path reaches the sink node of G_i. In that case, either agent j's path in G_i has an edge e that is used by c_e agents, or the path is used by agents $j, \ldots, n$. If the path contains an edge e that is used by c_e agents in r, the path cannot be used by more than c_e agents after the deviation. If the path is already used by agents $j, \ldots, n$, no other agents can join the path, since $j = \min C$. In both cases, the cost of agent j in G_i does not decrease.

Case 2: Agent j's sink node is an inner node of G_i. In that case, the only agents who can join

agent j's path in G_i are agents who reach the sink node of G_i. However, the agents are ordered so that all the agents who reach the sink node of G_i are indexed lower than j. These agents do not participate in the deviation, and we conclude that agent j cannot reduce the cost of her path in G_i.

We have shown that the cost of agent j cannot decrease after the deviation, which contradicts the assumption that the deviation is profitable. Therefore, r is a SE.

In the proof, we assumed that the source node s is the source node of G_1. If s is the source node of another subnetwork G_i, the subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_{i-1}$ are never used by any agent and can be ignored. If s is an inner node of subnetwork G_i, all the possible paths of all agents use the same edges in G_i, and no agent can reduce the cost of her path in G_i. □

Proof of Theorem 6.2. We first prove that the networks described in the theorem admit a SE. The proof is very similar to that of Theorem 6.1. Assume that $G = G_1 \to G_2 \to \ldots \to G_k$, where G_l is a network of parallel paths and $G_1, \ldots, G_{l-1}, G_{l+1}, \ldots, G_k$ are networks of parallel edges. Let Δ be a multi-source game played on G.

As in the proof of Theorem 6.1, the source and sink nodes of each agent define which of the subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ are used as part of her path. If the source or sink node of an agent is an inner node of G_l, there is only one path in G_l that reaches that node and the agent must use it.

In this proof, we assume that the agents are ordered in a way that agents whose source or sink node is an inner node of G_l come after all other agents. Formally, if j_1 is an agent that both her source and sink nodes are not inner nodes of G_l, and j_2 is an agent whose source or sink node is an inner node of G_l, then $j_1 < j_2$.

We now define a strategy profile r and show that it is a SE. The profile r is defined in two steps. First, if agent j's source or sink node is an inner node of subnetwork G_l, every possible path for that agent uses the same edges in G_l, so we assign these edges to the agent. This is only a part of agent j's path, and the rest of her path is determined in the next step. In the next step, we iterate through the subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ (including G_l). When subnetwork G_i is considered, we determine how many agents need to be assigned a path from the source node to the sink node of G_i, and compute these paths using Algorithm 1. Then, we assign each of the paths returned by the algorithm to the agents according to their order: The first agent j_1 who needs to be assigned a path in G_i gets the lowest-cost path returned by the algorithm. Then, the second agent $j_2 > j_1$ who needs a path in G_i is assigned the second lowest-cost path, and so on. This completes the definition of r.

We claim that the strategy profile r is a SE. Assume by contradiction that there is a coalition C that benefits from deviating to another profile, and let j be the minimal index of an agent in C.

Agent j can reduce her cost in G_i by moving to another path, or by sharing the cost of her path with another agent that deviates to that path. As in the proof of Theorem 3.4, agent j cannot use another path in a profitable deviation, as if there were such a path, the algorithm would have assigned that path to j earlier. So after the deviation, agent j must share her path in G_i with more agents compared to the original profile r. There are two cases.

Case 1: Agent j's path contains both the source and sink nodes of G_i. In that case, either agent j's path in G_i has an edge e that is used by c_e agents, or the path is used by agents $j, \ldots, n$. If the path contains an edge e that is used by c_e agents in r, the path cannot be used by more than c_e agents after the deviation. If the path is already used by agents $j, \ldots, n$, no other agents can join the path, since $j = \min C$. In both cases, the cost of agent j in G_i does not decrease.



Figure 10: SPP networks that do not admit a SE in games with multiple source and sink nodes

Case 2: $i = l$ and agent j's source or sink node is an inner node of G_l. In that case, the only agents who can join agent j's path in G_l are agents whose path contains both the source and sink nodes of G_l. However, the agents are ordered so that these agents are indexed lower than j. These agents do not participate in the deviation, and we conclude that agent j cannot reduce the cost of her path in G_l.

We have shown that the cost of agent j cannot decrease after the deviation, which contradicts the assumption that the deviation is profitable. Therefore, r is a SE.

The converse direction relies on previous proofs. For every non-SPP network, we have already shown that there is a symmetric CCS game played on it that has no SE. Epstein et al. [7] have provided an example of a game with multiple source and sink nodes that is played on the network depicted in Figure 10(a) and does not admit a SE. An equivalent game can be played on the network presented in Figure 10(b), by setting the cost of the additional edge to be 0. It is easy to show that one of the networks of Figure 10 is embedded in every SPP network $G = G_1 \to G_2 \to \ldots \to G_k$ that at least two of her subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ are not networks of parallel edges. By the arguments used in the proof of Theorem 3.6, it follows that these networks do not admit a SE. □

Proof of Theorem 6.3. Let Δ be a game played on an SPP network G such that $G = G_1 \to G_2 \to \ldots \to G_k$, and let s be a SE in Δ. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, it is sufficient to show that there is an optimal strategy profile s^*, such that for every coalition of agents C, the profile (s^*_C, s_{-C}) is feasible.

Let G_{OPT} be the subnetwork of G that is used by an optimal solution. We define a strategy profile s^* that uses edges only from G_{OPT}. The source and sink nodes of each agent define which of the subnetworks $G_1, \ldots, G_k$ are used as part of her path. We iterate through $G_1, \ldots, G_k$, and for every agent who uses edges from G_i, we define the path in G_i that this agent uses in s^*.

First, for each of the parallel paths in G_i that are used in both s and G_{OPT}, we assign each path to the same agents who use it in s. This includes all the agents whose source or sink node is an inner node of G_i, who must use a specific path in G_i in every strategy profile. This does not violate the capacity constraints due to the feasibility of s. Then, for the other agents who use G_i and still do not have a path, we assign them any available path in G_i that is part of G_{OPT}. Since there is a feasible strategy profile that uses only edges from G_{OPT}, there are enough available paths. This completes the definition of s^*.

We now prove that for every coalition of agents C, the profile $s_{comb} = (s^*_C, s_{-C})$ is feasible. Let e be an edge in G_i. Denote by M the set of agents that use e in s, and let M^* denote the set of agents that use e in s^*. The set of agents that use e in s_{comb} is $(M \cap C) \cup (M^* \cap (N \backslash C))$, where N is the set of all agents. If e is used only in s, it cannot exceed its capacity in s_{comb}, since $M \cap C \subseteq M$, and the profile s is feasible. The same applies to edges that are used only in s^*. It

remains to consider edges that are used in both s and s^*. In the definition of s^*, every agent who uses the simple path in G_i that contains e in s is also assigned the same path in s^*. It follows that $M \subseteq M^*$, and $(M \cap C) \cup (M^* \cap (N \backslash C)) \subseteq M^*$. Since s^* is a feasible solution, we conclude that e does not exceed its capacity in s_{comb}. Therefore, s_{comb} is feasible. □

Proof of Theorem 5.2 for Undirected Graphs. The extension of the theorem to undirected graphs has two parts. First, we have to show that the SE described in the proof is still a SE. Recall that in this profile, one agent uses the path (s, e, c, d, b, t) and pays 0.6, and the other agent uses the path (s, a, b, t) and pays $R + 1.3$. Note that the lowest possible cost an agent can incur is still 0.6, which means that the agent who pays 0.6 will not participate in a deviation. The other agent cannot deviate to any path that excludes the edge of cost R. Hence, the profile is a SE.

Second, we have to show that when the edges are undirected, there are no new SE that exclude the edge (b, t) that costs R. Note that any path in a SE does not contain a cycle that costs more than 0. We analyze the strategy profiles that use edges in the opposite direction in order to look for new SE.

Using any of the edges that are adjacent to the source or the sink in the opposite direction results in a cycle of non-zero cost. Hence, this cannot occur in a SE.

Any path that uses the edge (c, e) (in that direction) either contains the edge (e, t) or the edge (e, s). If an agent uses both (c, e) and (e, t), the edge (s, e) cannot be used by the other agent, and deviating to the path (s, e, t) is profitable. If the path of an agent contains the subpath (c, e, s), the path must contain a cycle, which is impossible in a SE.

Any feasible profile in which an agent uses one of the edges (b, a), (c, a), or (d, c) (in these directions) must contain a cycle that costs more than 0.

Finally, the only feasible profile without cycles in which the edge (b, d) is used (in that direction) contains the two paths (s, a, b, d, t) and (s, e, t). The costs of the paths are 1.8 and 1, respectively, and the agents can benefit by deviating to another profile, such as (s, a, c, d, t) and (s, a, b, t). We get that every SE must use the edge that costs R (and R can be arbitrarily high). □